



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

"'Tis life for life, and tooth for tooth!" they cry,  
 "Until the last man has avenged the soil!"

But see! the Army of the Pacifists  
 Sweeps through the World with answering bugle notes,  
 And drives the specters back into the shades.  
 From East and West and North and South they come,  
 Their banners haloed by the Dove of Peace;  
 While through the Heavens rings a clarion voice—  
*"Down With your Arms!"* ye Nations of the earth:"  
 "Ye Captains, send your soldiers to their plows!  
 Ye People, let your sure and strong defense  
 Lie in your schools, your franchise, and your faith!  
 Ye Parliaments, stamp fear from out your hearts!  
 Down with the blood avengers' creed of hate!  
 Down with your armaments and bloody wars!  
 Sweep all your mighty dreadnoughts from the seas!  
 Build ye the World a Capital of Peace!  
 A refuge unto you 'twill surely be,  
 A refuge from the blood avengers' wrath!—  
 "Hail! Brother Nations—Empire of the World!  
 Cease, cease your hateful jealousies! Proclaim  
 A World-United-Parliament-of-Peace!"

West Chicago, Ill.

\* Battle Cry of the Pacifist Army suggested by the late  
 Baroness von Suttner's novel.

## The Third Peace Conference at The Hague.\*

By Hon. Andrew D. White.

Pressing as are various other questions in the interest of peace, there are evidently just two which demand our closest attention and best thought here and now.

First of these is the Mexican trouble. It is serious and urgent; but, whatever we may think of earlier measures of our Government regarding it, the calling of the three great South American powers to take up the work of mediation was a most happy thing, both as regards the present and the future. Whether it shall succeed in this instance or not, it seems a movement of happy omen to the future of the world. But it puts us in an expectant attitude; for the present we must be content to wait.

The second of these two questions relates to the calling of the Third International Conference for Peace at The Hague. The time established by precedent, and, indeed, by the direct action of the Second Conference, for studying and discussing the questions to be taken up in it has now arrived. Seven years elapsed between the First Conference in 1899 and the preparation for the Second Conference in 1907. The seventh year since the Second Conference is now upon us, and we ought not to delay longer, for now comes upon us the question whether at least quasi-septennial sessions shall ripen into precedent or shall become mere matters of whim and chance.

Thus far there is everything to encourage us. At the close of the First Conference there were many expressions of disappointment at its result. It had been summoned by the Russian Czar to limit the ever-increasing armaments of the world, and almost the first thing done by the committee appointed to discuss that subject was to declare, by a virtually unanimous vote, that this was, at least for that time, impossible. Perhaps the most

powerful speech during the whole course of the conference was made by a Prussian general to show that such a limitation was not only impossible, but undesirable.

There was also at the outset an evident feeling of discouragement among the delegates. Perhaps no assemblage of the kind was ever begun with fainter hopes of success. The calls under which the body was brought together, though eloquent in parts, were by no means fully thought out or adequately expressed. They said little, if anything, regarding arbitration, and they seemed to hint at some sort of repression of the inventive powers of mankind as exercised on weapons and equipment of war. Probably no great representative assembly could have ever been brought together with less faith in the work proposed or less hope for any useful result.

A curious evidence of this was seen in the fact that one of the most eminent ambassadors present—one who afterward took an especially prominent part in all the deliberations—openly bewailed his fate in being called to take any part whatever in the matter. He considered it as the closing scene of his very long and creditable career, and lamented that this culminating duty assigned him could not end in any result useful or honorable. Nor was this eminent gentleman alone in these forebodings. The tone of informal discussion in the committee rooms and in social gatherings was at first wretchedly pessimistic, and this was generally so in the utterances of the older and more experienced members.

But there is an old French proverb to the effect that "eating brings appetite," and this was soon found to apply in this case. Hardly had the first hours of the first day of serious work passed than a more hopeful spirit dawned upon us. Such men as De Nigra, who, against fearful odds, had fought out the battle of Italian unity at the court of Napoleon III; Sir Julian Pauncefote, who had struggled long and well for better Anglo-American relations at Washington; De Martens, who had brought his brilliant gifts to bear in improving the diplomatic relations of Russia with rival powers in Europe and Asia, and various other strong men became evidently interested in the problems presented, and soon the outlook had evidently improved. Worthy ambition to do good work had begun to take the place of cynicism.

There were not wanting, it is true, some eminent members whose utterances remained from first to last hopelessly pessimistic. One especially—the representative of one of the greatest nations of the earth—was loud and long in insisting that the whole conference was the result of a determined intrigue to undermine the peace of Europe. He insisted, publicly and privately, in his walks and talks and in social intercourse, that the whole plan, both of limiting armaments and of promoting arbitration, was an invention of doctrinaires and professors—as an old patrician, he hated professors—and on one occasion he convulsed a great public dinner by exclaiming loudly, "Arbitration is a humbug; it is simply an invention of professors—*just like bacteria.*"

But ere long the really forceful members were working together with a good courage; the pessimists were left behind, and the results achieved are now matters of history.

So, too, are the results of the Second Conference, held in 1907, now before you, and each of these two great assemblies, both in what it accomplished and what it left unfinished, encourages us to call for a Third Conference.

\* Address delivered at the Twentieth Mohonk Conference, May 28, 1914.

Let me for a few moments indicate, in a general way, some of the main questions which were dealt with in those two former conferences and their bearing on what we may now hope to initiate and obtain by a Third Conference.

First and foremost, as to arbitration, I am glad to inform you that the United States took a leading and effective part in both conferences. The American delegation was the only one which appeared at the First Conference with a plan coherent and comprehensive. In various minor features it was modified, but its main purpose was steadily kept in view, and in spite of great discouragements was finally given effective shape, largely by the hearty co-operation of Great Britain, France, Italy, Austria-Hungary, Russia, and finally of Germany. The court thus agreed upon was to be chosen by the various powers, and was to consist of judges who were, so to speak, to be held in reserve in each country until, in some given case, the nations wishing arbitration should select out a suitable number of them, and these should then appear at The Hague to sit as a court and to hear arguments presented to them.

This arrangement has sometimes been criticised, and mainly because it does not give the world the spectacle of a court of arbitral justice in permanent session, day in and day out, year in and year out.

The argument that prevented the establishment of such a court in permanent session, highly desirable as all confess it to be, was very plain and practical. It took shape in the private discussions of experienced members of the conference much as follows:

"Such a court in permanent session must be composed of a large number of the most eminent jurists from all parts of the world; they must give up the comforts and satisfactions of life in their own countries; must remove their families from cherished homes and friends; must forget the ambitions of their previous lives; must forego the usual rewards and emoluments of great lawyers, and they must consequently be given very high salaries and pensions. There will be comparatively few cases brought before them at first, and they will probably sit year in and year out, always with little, and often with nothing, to do. Drawing high salaries, they will be in danger of becoming objects of unfavorable comment in the various legislative bodies of the world, and especially each year when their salaries or pensions must be provided for in the various national budgets. Under such circumstances partisan orators and newspaper writers, and even caricaturists, and perhaps novelists, will not be slow to make the court an object of ridicule; its members will be referred to as 'eating their heads off,' and the probable result will be that appropriations for their maintenance will be gradually omitted here and there, until at last the whole court may disappear in a cloud of derision."

Such was the general line of off-hand argument, heard more in private than in public, which led the First Conference to create a court composed of judges selected by the different governments, but remaining at home in their own countries, without salary until the services of a certain number of them should be required for work at The Hague.

I do not mean to say that such estimates of the dan-

gers threatening a tribunal at The Hague in constant session were, in themselves, convincing to the delegates; probably each of them could easily make a calculation showing that any modern battleship, even when lying idle, would cost more in a month than the whole international court in constant session would cost in a year, but the prevailing opinion became that it would be best to propose a tribunal such as I have sketched to you, at least as a beginning.

Fault has been found with it as not likely to be so easily and promptly assembled as a court in permanent session would be, and as not likely to create so consistent and valuable and ever-increasing an addition to international law. These arguments are valid, and will, it is to be hoped, lead to an additional tribunal to sit permanently. But that plan given to the world by the First Conference had certainly one merit which the excellent plan presented by the Second Conference had not, namely, this: *it was adopted*. The court was established, and it has ever since been found to work, and to work well.

The First Conference also provided what may be called an "executive committee" to prepare and smooth the way for the court and to care for it whenever it should assemble. This committee is composed of all the diplomatic representatives of the various nations residing at The Hague, and of this body the Netherlands Minister of Foreign Affairs is *ex officio* president.

In addition to the establishing of this court, the First Conference proposed and adopted a plan for what are called "Commissions of Enquiry." This plan, too, has proved practical; a modification of it at the time of the Dogger Bank catastrophe served a most noble purpose. You may recall the circumstances: The commander of a Russian squadron on its way from the Baltic to the Japanese seas, passing through fishing grounds off the English coast, imagined that the movements of the fishing vessels betokened an onslaught by Japanese vessels of war, and the result was that these Russian vessels fired upon those English fishermen with fearful havoc. This was followed by a very natural outburst of wrath throughout Great Britain. There were, of course, sensation mongers who developed the theory and spread the report that it was all a massacre deliberately planned by Russia against England, and bitterness increased until there came passionate appeals for war. Fortunately it was suggested that a committee of enquiry like that proposed at the First Hague Conference should be tried. This was done, and the conference deliberately and quietly conducted a thorough examination, with the result that passion was given time to cool, and it was found that beyond a doubt the calamity was the result of a mistake and panic. All the proper acknowledgments were made and full indemnities paid by Russia, repairing the losses as far as was humanly possible.

While we support our present administration at Washington in its effort at mediation now going on, one cannot but think that if a Commission of Enquiry, in accordance with the proposal of the First Hague Conference, had taken up and reported the result of an examination of the offenses which brought on the present difficulty between our own country and Mexico, the whole difficulty, now so portentous, might long since have been ended.

The First Conference, on the proposal of Mr. Holls, of the American delegation, also adopted a system which was known as the appointing of "seconding powers," and this, in a modified form, did good service in shortening the war between our own country and Spain, undoubtedly diminishing the expenditure of life and treasure in that contest. The First Conference also improved the laws and customs of war, and it also took up that great question which has been so near the heart of leading American statesmen from the days of Washington, Franklin, and Jefferson—the question of the immunity of private property not contraband of war from seizure on the high seas. Full discussion was given it, and though it could not be carried through at that time, it was made obligatory upon the Second Conference to take it up and advance it still further.

The Second Conference developed admirably the whole work of the First Conference, and added new achievements of great value. First and foremost in importance was its effort for an international court of appeals in prize cases. For generations this had been most earnestly desired. A plan was most carefully and wisely elaborated, and though it failed finally of passage, there is every reason to hope that a Third Conference can now take it up and pass it.

The attempt was also made by the Second Conference, as already stated, to develop a court of arbitration to be constantly in session at The Hague, and though it failed finally, its failure was due mainly to sundry subordinate considerations which it may well be hoped that a future conference will remove.

The Second Conference also rendered another great service: it erected a barrier against such efforts of schemers and speculators to drag nations into wars for financial purposes which, in days not far removed from our own time, have disgraced humanity.

The Second Conference also went on with improvements in the customs and laws of war which had begun at the First Conference, and reached most happy results preventing, unquestionably, very much human suffering and misery.

It also sought to make improvements in dealing with torpedoes and flying machines for war purposes, and, though only an insufficient agreement was then obtained, a beginning was made which a Third Conference ought to continue with definite and, indeed, blessed results.

In all this history of the first two conferences there is everything to encourage us. It has been well said that they accomplished for the welfare of mankind, as regards the humanizing and prevention of war, more than had been previously achieved during the two hundred and fifty years which had elapsed since Grotius made his great proposal for arbitration.

The question now comes, What subjects should be especially studied with reference to action in a Third Hague Conference? First of these may be named the limitation of armaments both by land and sea. I am aware that this question is especially difficult—more intricate, indeed, than any other. Still it is not too much to hope that the human mind may yet attack it with some measure of success. Mathematical powers like those of Newton and Kelvin and La Place and Leverrier and Gauss and our own Gibbs might well be employed upon such a problem. Human genius analogous

to what this would require was displayed in the plans and inspirations of Napoleon and Moltke; indeed, the sort of grasp and calculation required in balancing armaments and the probabilities and possibilities of their employment between rival powers seems to be already exercised to some degree in the German Kriegspiel—that great military game which has applied scientific calculations of chance to the operations of war not only in Germany, but in sundry other countries.

With new hopes also could now be taken up the question of an arbitration tribunal in permanent session and of an international prize court. The two conferences which have already been held have prepared the way for new successes in these fields which it may well be hoped the next conference will promote or achieve.

The question of immunity of private property not contraband from seizure at sea may also now be presented with better hopes of success. Germany and various other nations are favorable to it. France is only prevented from resuming its ancient support of it by temporary considerations which it may be hoped will soon pass away. Italy has furnished most earnest supporters of it, and even Great Britain, which has always been its opponent, is showing hopeful signs of a change of heart. Perhaps the best argument ever made for this great measure is to be found in the recent work of one of the most attractive English writers on international law—Mr. T. J. Lawrence.

Yet more immediately pressing among questions now upon us, which it would seem almost criminal to neglect, are those that relate to the use of torpedoes in blockading hostile ports and coasts. To various neutral powers the question of drifting torpedoes may at any moment become a matter of life and death, for it involves nothing less than the question whether quarreling nations may be allowed to scatter and neglect torpedoes in such manner as to endanger the peaceful fleets or merchant ships which cover the seas, and, among them, great ocean liners, with their crowds of peaceful passengers.

Most pressing of all are now coming upon us as never before the proper limitations in the use of flying machines for warlike purposes. Shall they be allowed simply to ascertain the positions and movements of armies, or shall they have liberty to drop magazines of high explosives upon camps, warships, and fortresses—or, indeed, shall they be allowed to blot out of existence unfortified cities and villages and the greatest triumphs of modern science and art? At present the only barrier that exists between the most frightful use of explosives and modern civilization is a mere temporary arrangement, with no really effective provisions for its enforcement. Already the newspapers inform us that in the war going on in Mexico the dropping of explosives of high power, without limit, has already come into use, and with fatal results.

These are among the questions which our Government ought to be studying; to their study ought to be summoned the most expert physicists and the most profound jurists. There is no more noble and more pressing employment for such men than this at this present time, and my hope is that a voice will go forth from this conference and from various organizations and assemblages, in the interest of peace throughout this and

other civilized countries, which will stir the powers of the world to do their duty in this emergency.

Thanks to a public-spirited American, the great International Temple of Peace stands today open and ready at The Hague for a meeting of the Third Conference. The international committee to take charge of all preliminary arrangements is, as you have seen, already provided. Let it be our duty, by all means in our power, to influence public opinion in our own country, and if possible in other countries, to follow the precedent already established by calling a third meeting of The Hague Conference and by promoting worthy and efficient preparation for it.

### Commerce Among Nations the Promoter of Peace.\*

By Hon. Paul Ritter, Minister from Switzerland to U. S. A., at Washington, D. C.

Two years ago Dr. Albert Gobat, the director of the International Peace Bureau at Berne, addressed you in this same room in an enthusiastic manner about that institution which, under his able management, has developed from a small beginning to its present great importance. Today this man is no more. On the 16th of March, 1914, while presiding at a conference of the International Peace Bureau, then assembled at Berne, he unexpectedly passed away at the age of 71 years. How highly Mr. Gobat appreciated his sojourn at Lake Mohonk is proven by his ardent letter, written to Berne from this hotel, which was published in the official organ of the Peace Bureau, *The Peace Movement*, of June 15, 1912.

Dr. Gobat was a prominent Swiss politician who, during thirty years, served as a member of our Parliament. His incessant work in the furtherance of the great idea of permanent international peace has made him known far beyond the borders of his fatherland. As the outward recognition of these efforts the Nobel prize was given him, followed later by his appointment as director of the International Peace Bureau at Berne, when this institution was considerably expanded, thanks to the generous financial aid from the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

With regard to your present program, I wish to say that the questions contained therein are of interest to me as a man and as a diplomat, but quite especially as a Swiss citizen. For many years the international policy of Switzerland has been eminently commercial. The development of my country offers an excellent illustration for the influence which peaceful conditions exert upon industry and international commerce.

The cross in the coat of arms of the Swiss Republic, which has been in existence these 623 years, and whose early history tells of sanguinary fights against land-grabbing neighbors, today has become the emblem of peace.

And if I, representing the ancient though small Helvetic Commonwealth, feel particularly comfortable and happy within your young, flourishing, and ever-growing Republic, it is because I continually discover new evi-

dence that our two countries are united not alone by friendship, but through many cordial relations and close resemblances.

Both are democracies and federated republics. The Swiss constitution of 1848 was a conscious imitation of the American constitution of 1789, with the difference, however, that in Switzerland a deviation was made in the mode of selecting the President. The highest executive authority in Switzerland is the Bundesrat, the federal council, composed of seven members, one of whom is chosen as President of the Confederation for the term of one year by the Parliament. After that term another of the seven federal councilors will be elected President, while his predecessor resumes his former place as member of the federal council. Seven years thereafter his turn will come again to take over the presidential office. While the Parliament elects every new President formally each year, this mode of succession is practically automatic.

But if Switzerland paid the United States the sincere compliment of following in her constitution the wise plans of organization laid down by the fathers of this great Republic, the United States returned the compliment when, in 1898, the first American State adopted the initiative and referendum originated in Switzerland.

Economically also there are resemblances to be found between our two republics. In both countries commerce and industry are flourishing. It may interest you to learn that Switzerland, with a population less numerous than that of the city of New York, has a general trade exceeding, for instance, the commerce of Spain or of the Japanese Empire. To mention but one industry: Switzerland, undisturbed by external influences, was able to export in 1912 more than 15 million watches, which means that of all watches entering into the world's trade nearly 90 per cent are of Swiss manufacture.

Three national languages are spoken within the boundaries of our republic: German, French, and Italian. The constantly increasing influx of foreigners from neighboring countries presents an immigration problem as perplexing as that which you face here today. Neither in Switzerland nor in the United States any single nation may claim to be the ethnological basis of the population. Socially the parallel is striking. The middle-class element is predominant. In both countries Protestantism is the prevailing creed, but at the same time important Catholic minorities exist.

Concerning the general education and public enlightenment, Switzerland occupies a place in continental Europe similar to that of the United States in the western hemisphere. Switzerland was the first country to open the doors of her universities to women, so that now more than 25 per cent of all the students at our seven universities are women, and nine-tenths of these foreigners, mostly Russians.

For a long time my country has pursued pedagogical reform as her peculiar mission. Rousseau, Pestalozzi, Father Girard, and Fellenberg were Swiss. Thus it has grown to be a custom, quite flattering to us, that our neighbors in Europe, and even in countries over the seas, send their children to Switzerland for the purpose of studying languages, music, and the arts.

Switzerland possesses no coasts, no ports, no fleet, no

\* Address delivered at the Lake Mohonk Conference, May 29, 1914.